

AIR QUALITY PERMIT

Issued To: JTL Group, Inc.
P.O. Box 147
Kalispell, MT 59903

Permit #2566-06
Application Complete: 03/21/07
Preliminary Determination Issued: 04/13/07
Department Decision Issued: 05/01/07
Permit Final: 05/17/07
AFS #777-2566

An air quality permit, with conditions, is hereby granted to JTL Group, Inc. (JTL), pursuant to Sections 75-2-204 and 211, Montana Code Annotated (MCA), as amended, and the Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) 17.8.740, *et seq.*, as amended, for the following:

Section I: Permitted Facilities

A. Plant Location

JTL operates a portable crushing/screening facility. However, Permit #2566-06 would apply while operating at any location in Montana, except within those areas having a Department of Environmental Quality (Department)-approved permitting program or those areas considered tribal lands. *A Missoula County air quality permit will be required for locations within Missoula County, Montana.* Addendum #2 applies to the JTL facility while operating at any location in or within 10 kilometers (km) of certain particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less (PM₁₀) nonattainment areas during the summer months (April 1 through September 30) and at sites approved by the Department during the winter months (October 1 through March 31). A complete list of the permitted equipment is contained in Section I.A of the permit analysis.

B. Current Permit Action

On March 14, 2007, the Department received a request from JTL for a modification to Permit #2566-05 to increase the maximum rated design capacity of the diesel generator from 1,060 kilowatts (kW) to 1,135 kW and add a two-deck screen rated at 100 tons per hour (TPH).

Section II: Limitations and Conditions

A. Operational Limitations and Conditions

1. JTL shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from any Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources (NSPS) affected crusher, any visible emissions that exhibit an opacity of 15% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.340, ARM 17.8.752, and 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOO).
2. JTL shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from any other NSPS affected equipment, such as screens or conveyor transfers, any visible emissions that exhibit an opacity of 10% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.340, ARM 17.8.752, and 40 CFR 60, Subpart OOO).
3. JTL shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere, from any

non-NSPS affected equipment, any visible emissions that exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.308 and ARM 17.8.752).

4. Water and water spray bars shall be available on site at all times and operated, as necessary, to maintain compliance with the opacity limitations in Sections II.A.1, II.A.2, and II.A.3 (ARM 17.8.752).
5. JTL shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from any street, road, or parking lot any visible fugitive emissions that exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes and must take reasonable precautions to control emissions of airborne particulate matter (ARM 17.8.308 and ARM 17.8.752).
6. JTL shall treat all unpaved portions of the haul roads, access roads, parking lots, or general plant area with water and/or chemical dust suppressant as necessary to maintain compliance with the reasonable precautions limitation in Section II.A.5 (ARM 17.8.749).
7. Crusher production from the facility shall be limited to 5,256,000 tons during any rolling 12-month time period (ARM 17.8.749).
8. JTL shall not operate more than two crushers at any given time and the maximum combined rated design capacity of the crushers shall not exceed 600 TPH (ARM 17.8.749).
9. Total combined screen production from the facility shall be limited to 13,140,000 tons during any rolling 12-month time period (ARM 17.8.749).
10. JTL shall not operate more than four screens at any given time and the maximum combined rated design capacity of the three screens shall not exceed 1,500 TPH (ARM 17.8.749).
11. JTL shall not operate more than one diesel generator at any given time and the maximum rated design capacity shall not exceed 1,135 kilowatts (kW) and shall not exceed 4,154 hours during any rolling 12-month time period (ARM 17.8.749 and ARM 17.8.1204).
12. If the permitted equipment is used in conjunction with any other equipment owned or operated by JTL, at the same site, production shall be limited to correspond with an emission level that does not exceed 250 tons of emissions during any rolling 12-month time period. Any calculations used to establish production levels shall be approved by the Department (ARM 17.8.749).
13. JTL shall comply with all applicable standards and limitations, and the reporting, recordkeeping, testing, and notification requirements contained in 40 CFR 60, Subpart OOO (ARM 17.8.340 and 40 CFR 60, Subpart OOO).

B. Testing Requirements

1. Within 60 days after achieving the maximum production rate, but no later than 180 days after initial startup, an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Method 9 opacity test and/or other methods and procedures, as specified in 40 CFR Part 60.675, must be performed on any NSPS affected equipment to

demonstrate compliance with the emissions limitations contained in Sections II.A.1 and II.A.2 (ARM 17.8.340, 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart A and Subpart OOO).

2. All compliance source tests shall conform to the requirements of the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual (ARM 17.8.106).
3. The Department may require further testing (ARM 17.8.105).

C. Operational Reporting Requirements

1. If this portable crushing/screening plant is moved to another location, an Intent to Transfer Form must be sent to the Department. In addition, a Public Notice Form for Change of Location must be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the area to which the transfer is to be made, at least 15 days prior to the move. The Intent to Transfer Form and the proof of publication (affidavit) of the Public Notice Form for Change of Location must be submitted to the Department prior to the move. These forms are available from the Department (ARM 17.8.765).
2. JTL shall maintain on-site records showing daily hours of operation and daily production rates for the last 12-months. All records compiled in accordance with this permit shall be maintained by JTL as a permanent business record for at least 5 years following the date of the measurement, must be available at the plant site for inspection by the Department, and must be submitted to the Department upon request (ARM 17.8.749).
3. JTL shall supply the Department with annual production information for all emission points, as required by the Department in the annual emission inventory request. The request will include, but is not limited to, all sources of emissions identified in the most recent emission inventory report and sources identified in Section I.A of the permit analysis.

Production information shall be gathered on a calendar-year basis and submitted to the Department by the date required in the emission inventory request. Information shall be in units as required by the Department. This information may be used for calculating operating fees, based on actual emissions from the facility, and/or to verify compliance with permit limitations (ARM 17.8.505).

4. JTL shall notify the Department of any construction or improvement project conducted, pursuant to ARM 17.8.745, that would include a change in control equipment, stack height, stack diameter, stack flow, stack gas temperature, source location, or fuel specifications, or would result in an increase in source capacity above its permitted operation or the addition of a new emission unit. The notice must be submitted to the Department, in writing, 10 days prior to start-up or use of the proposed de minimis change, or as soon as reasonably practicable in the event of an unanticipated circumstance causing the de minimis change, and must include the information requested in ARM 17.8.745(1)(d) (ARM 17.8.745).
5. JTL shall document, by month, the total crushing production for the facility. By the 25th day of each month, JTL shall calculate the total crushing production from the facility for the previous month. The monthly information will be used to verify compliance with the rolling 12-month limitation in Section II.A.7. The information for each of the previous months shall be submitted along with the annual emission inventory (ARM 17.8.749).

6. JTL shall document, by month, the total screening production for the facility. By the 25th day of each month, JTL shall calculate the total screening production from the facility for the previous month. The monthly information will be used to verify compliance with the rolling 12-month limitation in Section II.A.9. The information for each of the previous months shall be submitted along with the annual emission inventory (ARM 17.8.749).
7. JTL shall document, by month, the hours of operation of the diesel generator(s). By the 25th day of each month, JTL shall total the hours of operation of the diesel generator(s) during the previous 12 months to verify compliance with the limitation in Section II.A.11. A written report of the compliance verification shall be submitted along with the annual emissions inventory (ARM 17.8.749).
8. JTL shall annually certify that its emissions are less than those that would require the facility to obtain an air quality operating permit as required by ARM 17.8.1204(3)(b). The annual certification shall comply with the certification requirements of ARM 17.8.1207. The annual certification shall be submitted along with the annual emissions inventory information (ARM 17.8.749 and ARM 17.8.1204).

Section III: General Conditions

- A. Inspection - JTL shall allow the Department's representatives access to the source at all reasonable times for the purpose of making inspections or surveys, collecting samples, obtaining data, auditing any monitoring equipment or observing any monitoring or testing, and otherwise conducting all necessary functions related to this permit.
- B. Waiver - The permit and all the terms, conditions, and matters stated herein shall be deemed accepted if JTL fails to appeal as indicated below.
- C. Compliance with Statutes and Regulations - Nothing in this permit shall be construed as relieving JTL of the responsibility for complying with any applicable federal or Montana statute, rule or standard, except as specifically provided in ARM 17.8.740, *et seq.* (ARM 17.8.756).
- D. Enforcement - Violations of limitations, conditions and requirements contained herein may constitute grounds for permit revocation, penalties or other enforcement as specified in Section 75-2-401 *et seq.*, MCA.
- E. Appeals - Any person or persons jointly or severally adversely affected by the Department's decision may request, within 15 days after the Department renders its decision, upon affidavit setting forth the grounds therefore, a hearing before the Board of Environmental Review (Board). A hearing shall be held under the provisions of the Montana Administrative Procedures Act. The filing of a request for a hearing does not stay the Department's decision, unless the Board issues a stay upon receipt of a petition and a finding that a stay is appropriate under Section 75-2-211(11)(b), MCA. The issuance of a stay on a permit by the Board postpones the effective date of the Department's decision until conclusion of the hearing and issuance of a final decision by the Board. If a stay is not issued by the Board, the Department's decision on the application is final 16 days after the Department's decision is made.
- F. Permit Inspection - As required by ARM 17.8.755, Inspection of Permit, a copy of the air

quality permit shall be made available for inspection by Department personnel at the location of the permitted source.

- G. Permit Fees - Pursuant to Section 75-2-220, MCA, as amended by the 1991 Legislature, failure to pay of the annual operation fee by JTL may be grounds for revocation of this permit, as required by that Section and rules adopted thereunder by the Board.
- H. Construction Commencement - Construction must begin within 3 years of permit issuance and proceed with due diligence until the project is complete or the permit shall be revoked.
- I. The Department may modify the conditions of this permit based on local conditions of any future site. These factors may include, but are not limited to, local terrain, meteorological conditions, proximity to residences, etc.
- J. JTL shall comply with the conditions contained in this permit while operating at any location in Montana, except within those areas having a Department-approved permitting program.

PERMIT ANALYSIS
JTL Group, Inc.
Permit Number 2566-06

I. Introduction/Process Description

A. Permitted Equipment

JTL Group, Inc. (JTL) owns and operates a portable crushing/screening facility consisting of two portable crushers (up to 600 tons per hour (TPH)), four screens (up to 1,500 TPH), one diesel generator/engine (up to 1,135 kilowatts (kW)), and associated equipment.

B. Process Description

JTL proposes to use this crushing/screening plant and associated equipment to crush sand and gravel materials for use in various construction operations. For a typical operational setup, materials are loaded into the crushing/screening plant by a hopper, transferred by conveyor, and passed through the crushers. Materials are crushed by the crusher and sent to the three screens. Materials are screened, separated, and sent to stockpile for sale and use in construction operations.

C. Permit History

The Department of Environmental Quality (Department) issued **Permit #2566-00** to Empire Sand and Gravel Co. Inc. (Empire), on April 21, 1989. Permit #2566-00 allowed the operation of a portable gravel crushing plant, with conditions, consisting of a 1978 Telesmith Jaw Crusher, a 1988 Torgeson Horizontal Impact Crusher, a 1988 Barmac Rotapactor Mark III Crusher, and associated equipment.

Due to public comments received on a change of location request, the Department issued **Permit #2566A** on April 26, 1991. The modification consisted of adding three conditions to the permit that applied to the crushing/screening facility while operating in the gravel pit located in the SW¹/₄ of Section 18, Township 1 North, Range 15 East, in Sweet Grass County, Montana. Permit #2566A replaced Permit #2566-00.

On April 14, 1995, Empire submitted a request, along with a complete permit application to alter Permit #2566A. The alteration consisted of removing the 1978 Telesmith Jaw Crusher and the 1988 Torgeson Horizontal Impact Crusher from the permit. The alteration also added a 1995 Nordberg Cone Crusher, three 1979 Pioneer Screens, a 1988 El Jay Screen, a 1979 Pioneer Conveyor, a 1970 Kolberg Conveyor, a 1970 feed conveyor, a 1972 conveyor, a 1970 transfer conveyor, a 1970 sand reject conveyor, a 1970 scale conveyor, three 1971 100 foot conveyers, and associated equipment to the permit. **Permit #2566-01** replaced Permit #2566A.

On March 30, 2001, Empire requested that Permit #2566-01 be transferred to JTL, as Empire is currently being managed by JTL. This permit action transfers the permit from Empire to JTL. The emission inventory was also updated with current emission factors; however, the change does not increase emissions. In addition, the permit format and rule references were updated. **Permit #2566-02** replaced Permit #2566-01.

On December 25, 2005, the Department received a request from JTL for an administrative amendment to Permit #2566-02 to include an Addendum #1 to allow for wintertime operations (October 1-March 31) at locations in or within 10 km of a of

certain particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less (PM₁₀) nonattainment area and also requested that the permit be written in a de minimis friendly manner. SCREEN3 modeling was conducted in accordance with the Department's revised modeling guidance, to assist in the determination to allow for wintertime operations. Permit #2566-03 was written in a de minimis friendly manner, allowing JTL additional flexibility in facility operations while limiting facility emissions. Also, the permit was updated to reflect the current permit language and rule references used by the Department. **Permit #2566-03** replaced Permit #2566-02.

On January 30, 2006, the Department received a request from JTL for an administrative amendment to Permit #2566-03 to allow for summertime operations (April 1 – September 30) at any location in or within 10 km of the Butte, Columbia Falls, Libby, Kalispell, Thompson Falls, and Whitefish PM₁₀ nonattainment areas. **Permit #2566-04** replaced Permit #2566-03.

On August 18, 2006, the Department received a request from JTL for a modification to Permit #2566-04 to reduce the total crusher process rate from 2,800 tons per hour (TPH) to 600 TPH and to increase the hours of operation of the diesel generators. **Permit #2566-05** replaced Permit #2566-04 and **Addendum #2** replaced Addendum #1.

D. Current Permit Action

On March 14, 2007, the Department received a request from JTL for a modification to Permit #2566-05 to increase the maximum rated design capacity of the diesel generator from 1,060 kilowatts (kW) to 1,135 kW and add a two-deck screen rated at 100 tons per hour (TPH). **Permit #2566-06** replaces Permit #2566-05.

E. Additional Information

Additional information, such as applicable rules and regulations, Best Available Control Technology (BACT)/Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) determinations, air quality impacts, and environmental assessments, is included in the analysis associated with each change to the permit.

II. Applicable Rules and Regulations

The following are partial explanations of some applicable rules and regulations that apply to the facility. The complete rules are stated in the Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) and are available, upon request, from the Department. Upon request, the Department will provide references for locations of complete copies of all applicable rules and regulations or copies where appropriate.

A. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 1 - General Provisions, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.101 Definitions. This rule is a list of applicable definitions used in this subchapter, unless indicated otherwise in a specific subchapter.
2. ARM 17.8.105 Testing Requirements. Any person or persons responsible for the emission of any air contaminant into the outdoor atmosphere shall, upon written request of the Department, provide the facilities and necessary equipment (including instruments and sensing devices) and shall conduct tests, emission or ambient, for such periods of time as may be necessary using methods approved by the Department.

3. ARM 17.8.106 Source Testing Protocol. The requirements of this rule apply to any emission source testing conducted by the Department, any source, or other entity as required by any rule in this chapter, or any permit or order issued pursuant to this chapter, or the provisions of the Clean Air Act of Montana, 75-2-101, *et seq.*, Montana Code Annotated (MCA).

JTL shall comply with all requirements contained in the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual, including, but not limited to, using the proper test methods and supplying the required reports. A copy of the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual is available from the Department upon request.

4. ARM 17.8.110 Malfunctions. (2) The Department must be notified promptly by telephone whenever a malfunction occurs that can be expected to create emissions in excess of any applicable emission limitation or to continue for a period greater than 4 hours.
5. ARM 17.8.111 Circumvention. (1) No person shall cause or permit the installation or use of any device or any means which, without resulting in reduction in the total amount of air contaminant emitted, conceals or dilutes an emission of air contaminant that would otherwise violate an air pollution control regulation. (2) No equipment that may produce emissions shall be operated or maintained in such a manner as to create a public nuisance.

B. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 2 - Ambient Air Quality, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.210 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Sulfur Dioxide
2. ARM 17.8.211 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Nitrogen Dioxide
3. ARM 17.8.212 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Carbon Monoxide
4. ARM 17.8.220 Ambient Air Quality Standard for Settled Particulate Matter
5. ARM 17.8.223 Ambient Air Quality Standard for PM₁₀

JTL must maintain compliance with the applicable ambient air quality standards.

C. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 3 - Emission Standards, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.304 Visible Air Contaminants. This rule requires that no person may cause or authorize emissions to be discharged into the outdoor atmosphere from any source installed after November 23, 1968, that exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes.
2. ARM 17.8.308 Particulate Matter, Airborne. (1) This rule requires an opacity limitation of less than 20% for all fugitive emission sources and that reasonable precautions be taken to control emissions of airborne Particulate Matter (PM). (2) Under this rule, JTL shall not cause or authorize the use of any street, road, or parking lot without taking reasonable precautions to control emissions of airborne particulate matter.
3. ARM 17.8.309 Particulate Matter, Fuel Burning Equipment. This rule requires that no person shall cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere particulate matter caused by the combustion of fuel in excess of the amount determined by this section.

4. ARM 17.8.310 Particulate Matter, Industrial Processes. This rule requires that no person shall cause or allow to be discharged into the atmosphere particulate matter in excess of the amount set forth in this section.
5. ARM 17.8.322 Sulfur Oxide Emissions--Sulfur in Fuel. This rule requires that no person shall burn liquid, solid, or gaseous fuel in excess of the amount set forth in this section.
6. ARM 17.8.324 Hydrocarbon Emissions--Petroleum Products. (3) No person shall load or permit the loading of gasoline into any stationary tank with a capacity of 250 gallons or more from any tank truck or trailer, except through a permanent submerged fill pipe, unless such tank truck or trailer is equipped with a vapor loss control device as described in (1) of this rule.
7. ARM 17.8.340 Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources. This rule incorporates, by reference, 40 CFR 60, Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources (NSPS). The owner or operator of any stationary source or modification, as defined and applied in 40 CFR Part 60, NSPS, shall comply with the standards and provisions of 40 CFR Part 60. Subpart OOO, Standards of Performance for Nonmetallic Mineral Processing Plants, indicates that NSPS requirements apply to crushing facilities with capacities greater than 150 TPH and/or that were constructed after August 31, 1983. The JTL facility has a capacity in excess of 150 TPH and was constructed after August 31, 1983; therefore, NSPS requirements apply to the facility.

D. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 5 - Air Quality Permit Application, Operation, and Open Burning Fees, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.504 Air Quality Permit Application Fees. This rule requires that JTL submit an air quality permit application fee concurrent with the submittal of an air quality permit application. A permit application is incomplete until the proper application fee is paid to the Department. JTL submitted the required permit application fee for the current permit action.
2. ARM 17.8.505 Air Quality Operation Fees. An annual air quality operation fee must, as a condition of continued operation, be submitted to the Department by each source of air contaminants holding an air quality permit, excluding an open burning permit, issued by the Department. This air quality operation fee is based on the actual or estimated actual amount of air pollutants emitted during the previous calendar year.

An air quality operation fee is separate and distinct from an air quality permit application fee. The annual assessment and collection of the air quality operation fee, described above, shall take place on a calendar-year basis. The Department may insert into any final permit issued after the effective date of these rules, such conditions as may be necessary to require the payment of an air quality operation fee on a calendar-year basis, including provisions that pro-rate the required fee amount.

E. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 7 - Permit, Construction and Operation of Air Contaminant Sources, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.740 Definitions. This rule is a list of applicable definitions used in

this chapter, unless indicated otherwise in a specific subchapter.

2. ARM 17.8.743 Montana Air Quality Permits--When Required. This rule requires a person to obtain an air quality permit or permit alteration to construct, alter, or use any asphalt plant, crusher, or screen that has the Potential to Emit (PTE) greater than 15 tons per year of any pollutant. JTL has a PTE greater than 15 tons per year of total PM, PM₁₀, carbon monoxide (CO), and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x); therefore, an air quality permit is required.
3. ARM 17.8.744 Montana Air Quality Permits--General Exclusions. This rule identifies the activities that are not subject to the Montana Air Quality Permit Program.
4. ARM 17.8.745 Montana Air Quality Permits—Exclusion for De Minimis Changes. This rule identifies the de minimis changes at permitted facilities that do not require a permit under the Montana Air Quality Permit Program.
5. ARM 17.8.748 New or Modified Emitting Units--Permit Application Requirements. (1) This rule requires that a permit application be submitted prior to installation, modification, or use of a source. JTL submitted the required permit application for the current permit action. (7) This rule requires that the applicant notify the public by means of legal publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the application for a permit. JTL submitted an affidavit of publication of public notice for the March 18, 2007, issue of the *Daily Inter Lake*, a newspaper of general circulation in the city of Kalispell, in Flathead County, as proof of compliance with the public notice requirements.
6. ARM 17.8.749 Conditions for Issuance or Denial of Permit. This rule requires that the permits issued by the Department must authorize the construction and operation of the facility or emitting unit subject to the conditions in the permit and the requirements of this subchapter. This rule also requires that the permit must contain any conditions necessary to assure compliance with the Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA), the Clean Air Act of Montana, and rules adopted under those acts.
7. ARM 17.8.752 Emission Control Requirements. This rule requires a source to install the maximum air pollution control capability that is technically practicable and economically feasible, except that BACT shall be utilized. The required BACT analysis is included in Section IV of this permit analysis.
8. ARM 17.8.755 Inspection of Permit. This rule requires that air quality permits shall be made available for inspection by the Department at the location of the source.
9. ARM 17.8.756 Compliance with Other Requirements. This rule states that nothing in the permit shall be construed as relieving JTL of the responsibility for complying with any applicable federal or Montana statute, rule, or standard, except as specifically provided in ARM 17.8.740, *et seq.*
10. ARM 17.8.759 Review of Permit Applications. This rule describes the Department's responsibilities for processing permit applications and making permit decisions on those permit applications that do not require the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

11. ARM 17.8.762 Duration of Permit. An air quality permit shall be valid until revoked or modified, as provided in this subchapter, except that a permit issued prior to construction of a new or altered source may contain a condition providing that the permit will expire unless construction is commenced within the time specified in the permit, which in no event may be less than 1 year after the permit is issued.
12. ARM 17.8.763 Revocation of Permit. An air quality permit may be revoked upon written request of JTL, or for violations of any requirement of the Clean Air Act of Montana, rules adopted under the Clean Air Act of Montana, the FCAA, rules adopted under the FCAA, or any applicable requirement contained in the Montana State Implementation Plan (SIP).
13. ARM 17.8.764 Administrative Amendment to Permit. An air quality permit may be amended for changes in any applicable rules and standards adopted by the Board of Environmental Review (Board) or changed conditions of operation at a source or stack that do not result in an increase of emissions as a result of those changed conditions. The owner or operator of a facility may not increase the facility's emissions beyond permit limits unless the increase meets the criteria in ARM 17.8.745 for a de minimis change not requiring a permit, or unless the owner or operator applies for and receives another permit in accordance with ARM 17.8.748, ARM 17.8.749, ARM 17.8.752, ARM 17.8.755, and ARM 17.8.756, and with all applicable requirements in ARM Title 17, Chapter 8, Subchapters 8, 9, and 10.
14. ARM 17.8.765 Transfer of Permit. (1) This rule states that an air quality permit may be transferred from one location to another if the Department receives a complete notice of Intent to Transfer location, the facility will operate in the new location for less than 1 year, the facility will comply with the FCAA and the Clean Air Act of Montana, and the facility complies with other applicable rules. (2) This rule states that an air quality permit may be transferred from one person to another if written notice of Intent to Transfer, including the names of the transferor and the transferee, is sent to the Department.

F. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 8 - Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.801 Definitions. This rule is a list of applicable definitions used in this subchapter.
2. ARM 17.8.818 Review of Major Stationary Sources and Major Modifications--Source Applicability and Exemptions. The requirements contained in ARM 17.8.819 through ARM 17.8.827 shall apply to any major stationary source and any major modification with respect to each pollutant subject to regulation under the FCAA that it would emit, except as this subchapter would otherwise allow.

This facility is not a major stationary source since it is not a listed source and the facility's PTE is less than 250 tons per year of any pollutant (excluding fugitive emissions).

G. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 12 - Operating Permit Program Applicability, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.1201 Definitions. (23) Major Source under Section 7412 of the FCAA is defined as any stationary source having:

- a. PTE > 100 tons/year of any pollutant.
- b. PTE > 10 tons/year of any one Hazardous Air Pollutant (HAP), PTE > 25 tons/year of a combination of all HAPs, or lesser quantity as the Department may establish by rule, or
- c. PTE > 70 tons/year of PM₁₀ in a serious PM₁₀ nonattainment area.

2. ARM 17.8.1204 Air Quality Operating Permit Program Applicability. (1) Title V of the FCAA Amendments of 1990 requires that all sources, as defined in ARM 17.8.1204 (1), obtain a Title V Operating Permit. In reviewing and issuing Air Quality Permit #2566-06 for the JTL facility, the following conclusions were made:

- a. The facility's PTE is less than 100 tons/year for any pollutant.
- b. The facility's PTE is less than 10 tons/year for any one HAP and less than 25 ton/year of all HAPs.
- c. This source is not located in a serious PM₁₀ nonattainment area.
- d. This facility is not subject to any current NESHAP standards.
- e. The facility is currently subject to NSPS standards (40 CFR 60, Subpart A, General Provisions, and Subpart OOO, Non-Metallic Mineral Processing Plants).
- f. This source is not a Title IV affected source nor a solid waste combustion unit.
- g. This source is not an EPA designated Title V source.

JTL's diesel generator is limited to no more than 4,154 hours of operation during any rolling 12-month time period to keep the facility below the Title V permitting threshold of 100 tons/year of NO_x; therefore, the facility is not required to obtain a Title V Operating Permit. However, if minor sources subject to NSPS are required to obtain a Title V Operating Permit, JTL may be required to obtain an operating permit.

- h. ARM 17.8.1204(3). The Department may exempt a source from the requirement to obtain an air quality operating permit by establishing federally enforceable limitations that limit that source's potential to emit.
 - i. In applying for an exemption under this rule, the owner or operator of the source shall certify to the Department that the source's

potential to emit does not require the source to obtain an air quality operating permit.

- ii. Any source that obtains a federally enforceable limit on potential to emit shall annually certify that its actual emissions are less than those that would require the source to obtain an air quality operating permit.

The Department determined that the annual reporting requirements contained in the permit are sufficient to satisfy this requirement.

3. ARM 17.8.1207 Certification of Truth, Accuracy, and Completeness. The compliance certification submittal required by ARM 17.8.1204(3) shall contain a certification of truth, accuracy, and completeness by a responsible official. This certification and information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, the statements and information in the document are true, accurate, and complete.

III. BACT Analysis

A BACT determination is required for any new or altered source. JTL shall install on the new or altered source the maximum air pollution control capability that is technologically practicable and economically feasible, except that BACT shall be used.

A. Area Source Fugitive Emissions, Crushing/Screening Emissions, and Lime Silo Emissions

Two types of emissions controls are readily available and used for dust suppression of fugitive emissions at the site, fugitive emissions for the surrounding area of operations, and for equipment emissions from the crushing/screening operation. These two control methods are water and chemical dust suppressant. Chemical dust suppressant could be used for dust suppression on the area surrounding the crushing/screening operation and for emissions from the crushing/screening operation. However, because water is more readily available, is more cost effective, is equally effective as chemical dust suppressant, and is more environmentally friendly, water has been identified as the most appropriate method of pollution control of particulate emissions for the general plant area. In addition, water suppression has been required of recently permitted similar sources. JTL may, however, use chemical dust suppressant to assist in controlling particulate emissions from the surrounding plant area.

JTL shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from any NSPS-affected crusher, any visible emissions that exhibit an opacity of 15% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. Also, JTL shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from any affected screen, any visible emissions that exhibit an opacity of 10% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. Further, JTL shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from any non-NSPS affected equipment, any visible emissions that exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. JTL must also take reasonable precautions to limit the fugitive emissions of airborne particulate matter from haul roads, access roads, parking areas, and the general area of operation. JTL is required to have water spray bars and water available on site (at all times) and to apply the water, as necessary, to maintain compliance with the opacity and reasonable precaution limitations. JTL may also use chemical dust suppression, in order to maintain compliance with emission limitations in Section I.A of Permit #2566-06. The Department determined that using water spray bars, water, and chemical dust suppressant to maintain compliance with the opacity requirements and reasonable precaution limitations constitutes BACT for the new two-deck screen.

B. Diesel Generators

Because of the limited amount of emissions produced by the diesel generator/engine and the lack of readily available/cost effective add-on controls, add-on controls would be cost prohibitive. Therefore, the Department determined that proper operation and maintenance with no additional controls would constitute BACT for the diesel generator/engine.

The control options required for the proposed diesel generator and two-deck screen are similar to other recently permitted similar sources.

IV. Emission Inventory

Source	Tons/Year					
	PM	PM ₁₀	NO _x	VOC	CO	SO _x
Crushers (up to 600 TPH)	3.15	3.37				
Screens (up to 1,500 TPH)	13.49	10.52				
Truck Unloading	0.61	0.20				
Material Transfer	4.91	1.61				
Pile Forming	42.05	19.71				
Engine/Generator (up to 1,135 kW)	2.21	2.21	98.02	2.23	21.12	10.23
Haul Roads	12.68	3.60				
Total	79.11	33.30	98.02	2.23	21.12	10.23

Note: A complete emission inventory for Permit #2566-06 is on file with the Department. A limitation of 4,154 annual hours of operation per rolling 12-month time period was placed on the diesel engine/generator in order to keep emissions below the 100 tons per year threshold established for NO_x.

V. Existing Air Quality

Permit #2566-06 is issued for the operation of a portable crushing/screening facility to operate at various locations throughout Montana. This facility would be allowed to operate at any area designated as attainment or unclassified for all National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS); excluding those counties that have a Department-approved permitting program, those areas considered tribal lands, or those areas in or within 10 km of certain PM₁₀ nonattainment areas. *A Missoula County air quality permit would be required for locations within Missoula County, Montana.* Addendum #2 of Permit #2566-06 would cover this portable crushing/screening plant while operating at locations in or within 10 km of a PM₁₀ nonattainment area during the winter season (October 1 through March 31). Addendum #2 of Permit #2566-06 would also allow for summertime operations (April 1 through September 30) at any location in or within 10 km of the Butte, Columbia Falls, Libby, Kalispell, Thompson Falls, and Whitefish PM₁₀ nonattainment areas.

VI. Air Quality Impacts

Based on the information provided and the conditions established in Permit #2566-06, the Department believes that the amount of controlled emissions generated by this facility will not exceed any ambient air quality standard established for any of Montana's attainment or unclassified ambient air quality areas. Additionally, the limitations and conditions established in Addendum #2 would further reduce the facility emissions generated while operating in the nonattainment areas and would also be protective of corresponding ambient air quality standards.

In addition, this source is portable and any air quality impacts will be minimal. The conditions in Permit #2566-06 will be protective of air quality while operating at locations not located in or within 10 km of certain PM₁₀ nonattainment areas.

Addendum #2
JTL Group, Inc.
Permit #2566-06

An addendum to air quality Permit #2566-06 is issued to JTL Group, Inc. (JTL), pursuant to Sections 75-2-204 and 75-2-211 of the Montana Code Annotated (MCA), as amended, and the Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) 17.8.765, as amended, for the following:

I. Permitted Equipment

JTL owns and operates a portable crushing/screening facility consisting of two portable crushers (up to 600 tons per hour (TPH)), one diesel generator/engine (up to 1,135 kilowatts (kW)), four screens (up to 1,500 TPH), and associated equipment. JTL operates at various locations throughout Montana, including in or within 10 kilometers (km) of the following certain particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less (PM₁₀) nonattainment areas: Butte, Columbia Falls, Kalispell, Libby, Thompson Falls, and Whitefish.

II. Seasonal and Site Restrictions

Addendum #2 applies to the JTL facility while operating at any location in or within 10 km of certain PM₁₀ nonattainment areas. Additionally, seasonal and site restrictions apply to the facility as follows:

- A. During the winter season (October 1 through March 31) – The only location(s) in or within 10 km of certain PM₁₀ nonattainment area where JTL may operate is:
- NE ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 23, Township 30 North, Range 21 West (A-1 Paving Hodgson Road Pit);
 - NE ¼ of the NE ¼ of Section 26, Township 29 North, Range 22 West (Tutvedt Pit);
 - NW ¼ of the NW ¼ of Section 22, Township 29 North, Range 21 West (A-1 Paving Pit);
 - NW ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 36, Township 30 North, Range 21 West (County Pit);
 - SW ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 2, Township 28 North, Range 21 West (River Pit);
 - SW ¼ of the NW ¼ of Section 2, Township 28 North, Range 21 West (River Pit);
 - and
 - Any other site that may be approved, in writing, by the Department of Environmental Quality (Department).
- B. During the summer season (April 1 through September 30) – JTL may operate at any location in or within 10 km of the Butte, Columbia Falls, Libby, Kalispell, Thompson Falls, and Whitefish PM₁₀ nonattainment areas.
- C. JTL shall comply with the limitations and conditions contained in Addendum #2 to Permit #2566-06. Addendum #2 shall be valid until revoked or modified. The Department reserves the authority to modify Addendum #2 at any time based on local conditions of any future site. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, local terrain, meteorological conditions, proximity to residences or other businesses, etc.

III. Limitations and Conditions

- A. Operational Limitations and Conditions – **Winter Season (October 1 – March 31)**
1. Water spray bars must be operated, as necessary, on the crushers, screens, and all transfer points to maintain compliance with the opacity limitations contained in Section III.A.2 and Section III.A.3 (ARM 17.8.749).

2. All visible emissions from the crushing/screening plant may not exhibit an opacity of 10% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.749).
3. JTL shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from any other equipment, such as transfer points, any visible emissions that exhibit an opacity of 10% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.749).
4. JTL shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from haul roads, access roads, parking lots, or the general plant property any visible fugitive emissions that exhibit an opacity of 10% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.749).
5. JTL shall treat all unpaved portions of the haul roads, access roads, parking lots, and general plant area with water and/or chemical dust suppressant as necessary to maintain compliance with the 10% opacity limitation (ARM 17.8.749).
6. Total combined crushing production from the two crushers shall not exceed 7,920 tons during any rolling 24-hour time period (ARM 17.8.749).
7. Total combined screening production from the four screens shall be limited to 19,800 tons during any rolling 24-hour time period (ARM 17.8.749).
8. JTL shall not operate more than one diesel generator at any given time and the maximum rated design capacity shall not exceed 1,135 kilowatts (kW) and shall not exceed 11.3 hours of operation during any rolling 24-hour time period (ARM 17.8.749).

B. Operational Limitations and Conditions – Summer Season (April 1 – September 30)

1. Water spray bars must be operated, as necessary, on the crushers, screens, and all transfer points to maintain compliance with the opacity limitations contained in Section III.B.2 and Section III.B.3 (ARM 17.8.749).
2. All visible emissions from the crushing/screening plant may not exhibit an opacity of 10% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.749).
3. JTL shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from any other equipment, such as transfer points, any visible emissions that exhibit an opacity of 10% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.749).
4. JTL shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from haul roads, access roads, parking lots, or the general plant property any visible fugitive emissions that exhibit an opacity of 10% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.749).
5. JTL shall treat all unpaved portions of the haul roads, access roads, parking lots, and general plant area with water and/or chemical dust suppressant as necessary to maintain compliance with the 10% opacity limitation (ARM 17.8.749).
6. Total combined crushing production from the two crushers shall not exceed 14,400 tons during any rolling 24-hour time period (ARM 17.8.749).

7. Total combined screening production from the four screens shall be limited to 36,000 tons during any rolling 24-hour time period (ARM 17.8.749).
8. JTL shall not operate more than one diesel generator at any given time and the maximum rated design capacity shall not exceed 1,135 kilowatts (kW) and shall not exceed 11.3 hours of operation during any rolling 24-hour time period (ARM 17.8.749).

C. Operational Reporting Requirements

1. JTL shall provide the Department with written notification of job completion within 10 working days of job completion (ARM 17.8.749).
2. JTL shall provide the Department with written notice of relocation of the permitted equipment within 15 working days before the physical transfer of the equipment (ARM 17.8.765).
3. Production information for the sites covered by this addendum must be submitted to the Department with the annual emission inventory request or within 30 days of completion of the project. The information must include (ARM 17.8.749):
 - a. Tons of material crushed at each site;
 - b. Tons of material screened by each screen at each site;
 - c. Tons of bulk material loaded at each site;
 - d. Daily hours of operation at each site;
 - e. Gallons of diesel fuel used for the generators/engines at each site;
 - f. Fugitive dust information consisting of a listing of all plant vehicles including the following for each vehicle type:
 - i. Number of vehicles;
 - ii. Vehicle type;
 - iii. Vehicle weight, loaded;
 - iv. Vehicle weight, unloaded;
 - v. Number of tires on vehicle;
 - vi. Average trip length;
 - vii. Number of trips per day per vehicle;
 - viii. Average vehicle speed;
 - ix. Area of activity; and
 - x. Vehicle fuel usage (gasoline or diesel) annual total.
 - g. Fugitive dust control for haul roads and general plant area:
 - i. Hours of operation of water trucks; and
 - ii. Application schedule for chemical dust suppressant, if applicable.
4. JTL shall document, by day, the total crushing production during the winter season. JTL shall sum the total crushing production during the previous 24 hours

to verify compliance with the limitations in Section III.A.6. A written report of compliance verification and the emissions inventory shall be submitted to the Department annually. The report for the previous calendar year shall be submitted along with the annual emission inventory (ARM 17.8.749).

5. JTL shall document, by day, the total crushing production during the summer season. JTL shall sum the total crushing production during the previous 24 hours to verify compliance with the limitations in Section III.B.6. A written report of compliance verification and the emissions inventory shall be submitted to the Department annually. The report for the previous calendar year shall be submitted along with the annual emission inventory (ARM 17.8.749).
6. JTL shall document, by day, the combined total screening production during the winter season. JTL shall sum the combined total screening production during the previous 24 hours to verify compliance with the limitations in Section III.A.7. A written report of compliance verification and the emissions inventory shall be submitted to the Department annually. The report for the previous calendar year shall be submitted along with the annual emission inventory (ARM 17.8.749).
7. JTL shall document, by day, the combined total screening production during the summer season. JTL shall sum the combined total screening production during the previous 24 hours to verify compliance with the limitations in Section III.B.7. A written report of compliance verification and the emissions inventory shall be submitted to the Department annually. The report for the previous calendar year shall be submitted along with the annual emission inventory (ARM 17.8.749).
8. JTL shall document, by day, the hours of operation of the diesel generator(s) during the winter season. JTL shall total the hours of operation of the diesel generator(s) during the previous 24 hours to verify compliance with the limitations in Section III.A.8. A written report of compliance verification and the emissions inventory shall be submitted to the Department annually. The report for the previous calendar year shall be submitted along with the annual emission inventory (ARM 17.8.749).
9. JTL shall document, by day, the hours of operation of the diesel generator(s) during the summer season. JTL shall total the hours of operation of the diesel generator(s) during the previous 24 hours to verify compliance with the limitations in Section III.B.8. A written report of compliance verification and the emissions inventory shall be submitted to the Department annually. The report for the previous calendar year shall be submitted along with the annual emission inventory (ARM 17.8.749).

Addendum #2 Analysis
JTL Group, Inc.
Permit #2566-06

I. Permitted Equipment

JTL Group, Inc. (JTL) owns and operates a portable crushing/screening facility consisting of two portable crushers (up to 600 tons per hour (TPH)), four screens (up to 1,500 TPH), one diesel generator/engine (up to 1,135 kilowatts (kW)), and associated equipment. JTL operates at various locations throughout Montana, including in or within 10 kilometers (km) of the following certain particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less (PM₁₀) nonattainment areas: Butte, Columbia Falls, Kalispell, Libby, Thompson Falls, and Whitefish.

II. Source Description

JTL proposes to use this crushing/screening plant and associated equipment to crush sand and gravel materials for use in various construction operations. For a typical operational setup, materials are loaded into the crushing/screening plant by a hopper and transferred by conveyor and passed through the crusher. Materials are crushed, by the crusher and sent to the two screens. Materials are screened, separated, and sent to stockpile for sale and use in construction operations.

III. Applicable Rules and Regulations

The following are partial quotations of some applicable rules and regulations that apply to the facility. The complete rules are stated in the Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) and are available, upon request, from the Department of Environmental Quality (Department). Upon request, the Department will provide references for locations of complete copies of all applicable rules and regulations or copies where appropriate.

ARM 17.8, Subchapter 7 - Permit, Construction and Operation of Air Contaminant Sources, including, but not limited to:

- A. ARM 17.8.749 Conditions for Issuance of Permit. This rule requires that the source demonstrate compliance with applicable rules and standards before a permit can be issued. Also, a permit may be issued with such conditions as are necessary to assure compliance with all applicable rules and standards. JTL demonstrated compliance with all applicable rules and standards as required for permit issuance.
- B. ARM 17.8.764 Modification of Permit. An air quality permit may be modified for changes in any applicable rules and standards adopted by the Board of Environmental Review (Board) or changed conditions of operation at a source or stack which do not result in an increase in emissions because of the changed conditions. A source may not increase its emissions beyond those found in its permit unless the source applies for and receives another permit.
- C. ARM 17.8.765 Transfer of Permit. An air quality permit may be transferred from one location to another if:
 - 1. Written notice of Intent to Transfer location and proof of public notice are sent to the Department;
 - 2. The source will operate in the new location for a period of less than 1 year; and

3. The source will not have any significant impact on any nonattainment area or any Class I area.

JTL must submit proof of compliance with the transfer and public notice requirements when JTL transfers to any of the locations covered by this addendum and will only be allowed to stay in the new location for a period of less than 1 year. Also, the conditions and limitations in Addendum #2 to Permit #2566-06 will prevent JTL from having a significant impact on PM₁₀ nonattainment areas.

IV. Emission Inventory

Source	Lb/Day					
	PM	PM ₁₀	NO _x	VOC	CO	SO _x
Crushers (up to 600 TPH)	7.08	3.19				
Screens (up to 1,500 TPH)	30.30	10.19				
Truck Unloading	1.37	0.45				
Material Transfer	11.02	3.62				
Pile Forming	94.46	44.28				
Engine/Generator (up to 1,135 kW)	4.97	12.13	537.11	12.21	52.13	25.25
Haul Roads	28.49	8.10				
Total	177.72	81.96	537.11	12.21	52.13	25.25

Note: Emission inventory for winter season.

Source	Lb/Day					
	PM	PM ₁₀	NO _x	VOC	CO	SO _x
Crushers (up to 600 TPH)	17.28	7.78				
Screens (up to 1,500 TPH)	73.92	24.86				
Truck Unloading	3.36	1.10				
Material Transfer	26.88	8.83				
Pile Forming	230.40	108.00				
Engine/Generator (up to 1,135 kW)	12.13	12.13	537.11	12.21	52.13	25.25
Haul Roads	69.50	19.75				
Total	433.47	182.45	537.11	12.21	52.13	25.25

Note: Emission inventory for summer season.

V. Existing Air Quality

On July 1, 1987, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) promulgated new National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for PM₁₀. Due to exceedances of the national standards for PM₁₀, the cities of Kalispell (and the nearby Evergreen area), Columbia Falls, Butte, Whitefish, Libby, Missoula, and Thompson Falls were designated by EPA as nonattainment for PM₁₀. As a result of this designation, EPA required the Department and the City-County Health Departments submit PM₁₀ State Implementation Plans (SIP). The SIPs consisted of emission control plans that controlled fugitive dust emissions from roads, parking lots, construction, and demolition, since technical studies determined these sources to be the major contributors to PM₁₀ emissions.

Addendum #2 to Permit #2566-06 is for a portable crushing/screening plant to locate at sites in or within 10 km of certain PM₁₀ nonattainment areas during the winter season (October 1 through March 31). Winter season (October 1 through March 31) operations many include only the locations listed in Section II.A of Addendum #2. Addendum #2 of Permit #2566-06 would also allow for summertime operations (April 1 – September 30) at any location in or within 10 km of the Butte, Columbia Falls, Libby, Kalispell, Thompson Falls, and Whitefish PM₁₀ nonattainment areas.

VI. Air Quality Impacts

JTL applied for an air quality permit to operate a portable crushing/screening plant to be located at various locations throughout Montana. Permit #2566-06 and Addendum #2 will cover the JTL crushing/screening plant while operating at any location within Montana, excluding those counties that have a Department-approved permitting program and those areas considered tribal lands. Based on the information provided, the amount of controlled emissions generated by this facility will not exceed any ambient air quality standard. In addition, this source is portable and any air quality impacts will be minimal.

VII. Taking or Damaging Implication Analysis

As required by 2-10-101 through 105, Montana Code Annotated (MCA), the Department conducted a private property taking and damaging assessment and determined there are no taking or damaging implications.

VIII. Environmental Assessment

An environmental assessment, required by the Montana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA), was completed for this project. A copy is attached.

Analysis Prepared By: Eric Thunstrom
Date: March 29, 2007

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
Permitting and Compliance Division
Air Resources Management Bureau
1520 East Sixth Avenue
P.O. Box 200901
Helena, Montana 59620-0901
(406) 444-3490

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

Issued For: JTL Group, Inc.

Permit Number: #2566-06

Preliminary Determination Issued: 04/13/07

Department Decision Issued: 05/01/07

Permit Final: 05/17/07

1. *Legal Description of Site:* JTL operates a portable crushing/screening facility. Permit #2566-06 would apply while operating at any location in Montana, except within those areas having a Department-approved permitting program or those areas considered tribal lands. *A Missoula County air quality permit will be required for locations within Missoula County, Montana.* Addendum #2 applies to the JTL facility while operating at any location in or within 10 km of certain PM₁₀ nonattainment areas during the summer months (April 1 through September 30) and at sites approved by the Department during the winter months (October 1 through March 31).
2. *Description of Project:* On March 14, 2007, the Department received a request from JTL for a modification to Permit #2566-05 to increase the maximum rated design capacity of the diesel generator from 1,060 kW to 1,135 kW and add a two-deck screen rated at 100 TPH.
3. *Objectives of Project:* The object of the project would be to produce business and revenue for the company through the sale and use of aggregate. The issuance of Permit #2566-06 would allow JTL to operate the permitted equipment at various locations throughout Montana.
4. *Additional Project Site Information:* In many cases, this crushing/screening operation may move to a general site location or open cut pit, which has been previously permitted through the Industrial and Energy Minerals Bureau (IEMB). If this were the case, additional information for the site would be found in the Mined Land Reclamation Permit for that specific site.
5. *Alternatives Considered:* In addition to the proposed action, the Department considered the "no-action" alternative. The "no-action" alternative would deny issuance of the air quality preconstruction permit to the proposed facility. However, the Department does not consider the "no-action" alternative to be appropriate because JTL demonstrated compliance with all applicable rules and regulations as required for permit issuance. Therefore, the "no-action" alternative was eliminated from further consideration.
6. *A Listing of Mitigation, Stipulations, and Other Controls:* A listing of the enforceable permit conditions and a permit analysis, including a BACT analysis, would be contained in Permit #2566-06.

7. *Regulatory Effects on Private Property Rights:* The Department considered alternatives to the conditions imposed in this permit as part of the permit development. The Department determined the permit conditions would be reasonably necessary to ensure compliance with applicable requirements and to demonstrate compliance with those requirements and would not unduly restrict private property rights.
8. *The following table summarizes the potential physical and biological effects of the proposed project on the human environment. The “no action alternative” was discussed previously.*

		Major	Moderate	Minor	None	Unknown	Comments Included
A.	Terrestrial and Aquatic Life and Habitats			X			yes
B.	Water Quality, Quantity, and Distribution			X			yes
C.	Geology and Soil Quality, Stability, and Moisture			X			yes
D.	Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality			X			yes
E.	Aesthetics			X			yes
F.	Air Quality			X			yes
G.	Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resource				X		yes
H.	Demands on Environmental Resource of Water, Air, and Energy			X			yes
I.	Historical and Archaeological Sites				X		yes
J.	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts			X			yes

Summary of Comments on Potential Physical and Biological Effects: The following comments have been prepared by the Department.

A. Terrestrial and Aquatic Life and Habitats

Terrestrials would use the same area as the aggregate crushing/screening operations. Impacts on terrestrial and aquatic life could result from storm water runoff and pollutant deposition, but such impacts would be minor, because the JTL crushing/screening operation is an existing facility, would be considered a minor source of emissions, and would have intermittent and seasonal operations. The additional emissions associated with the current permit action would have only minor effects on terrestrial and aquatic life because facility emissions would be well dispersed in the area of operations (see Section 8.F of this EA). Furthermore, since JTL would generally locate at a pre-existing pit, additional impacts to the terrestrial and aquatic life and habitats would be minor. Therefore, only minor and temporary effects to terrestrial and aquatic life and habitat would be expected from the proposed crushing/screening operation.

B. Water Quality, Quantity, and Distribution

Water would be required for dust suppression on the surrounding roadways and areas of operation and for pollution control for equipment operations. However, pollutant deposition and water use would cause only minor, if any, impacts to water resources in these areas because the facility has readily available water resources from which to draw and, yet, would be far enough away from those resources that any pollutant deposition would be dispersed before reaching the surface water resources. The facility would only require a relatively small amount of water for pollution control and would only have minor amounts of pollutant deposition (see Section 8.F of

this EA). Further the site is in an existing permitted open-cut pit where water runoff would be more readily controlled. Therefore, at most, only minor surface and groundwater quality impacts would be expected.

C. Geology and Soil Quality, Stability, and Moisture

The proposed project would have only minor impacts on geology and soil quality, stability, and moisture because the proposed site is an existing gravel pit, deposition of air pollutants on soils would be minor (see Section 8.F of this EA), only minor amounts of water would be required to be used for pollution control, and only minor amounts of pollution would be generated. In addition, the pollutants would be widely dispersed before settling upon vegetation and surrounding soils (see Section 8.D of this EA). Therefore, any effects upon geology and soil quality, stability, and moisture at this proposed operational site would be minor.

D. Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality

Minor impacts would occur on vegetative cover, quality, and quantity because the proposed project would operate in an area where vegetation has been previously disturbed. Pollutants would be greatly dispersed and corresponding deposition on vegetation from the proposed project would be minor (see Section 8.F of this EA). Therefore, because water use and corresponding water runoff would be minimal, only minimal amounts of vegetation exists within the pit, and minimal vegetation outside the pit would be impacted, the associated impacts upon vegetation would be minimal.

E. Aesthetics

This proposed project would be visible and would create noise while operating at the existing gravel pit site. However, Permit #2566-06 would include conditions to control emissions, including visible emissions, from the plant. Also, permit limitations and conditions from Addendum #2 would apply when the facility is operating in nonattainment areas. Since this is an existing portable crushing/screening facility and would operate on an intermittent and seasonal basis, any visual aesthetic impacts would be minor and short-lived.

F. Air Quality

Additional air quality impacts from the proposed project would be minor because this is an existing facility that would operate on an intermittent and temporary basis and would be located at previously disturbed sites. Permit #2566-06 would include conditions limiting the facility's opacity and the facility's crushing/screening production. Permit #2566-06 would also require water and water spray bars be available on site and used to control emissions. Permit #2566-06 would also limit total emissions from the crushing/screening facility and any additional JTL equipment operated at the site to 250 tons/year or less, excluding fugitive emissions. Additionally, Addendum #2 would apply while the facility is operating in or within 10 km of a certain PM₁₀ nonattainment areas and would impose more stringent requirements for operations within those areas.

Pollutant deposition from the proposed project would be minimal because the pollutants emitted would be widely dispersed (from factors such as wind speed and wind direction) and would have minimal deposition on the surrounding area (due to site topography of the area and minimal vegetative cover in the area). Therefore, air quality impacts from the proposed project operating in this area would be minor.

G. Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resources

The Department, in an effort to assess any potential impacts to any unique endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources previously contacted the Montana Natural Heritage Program (MNHP). Search results concluded there were no known environmental resources of special concern within the area. Therefore, the Department determined that it would be unlikely that the proposed project would impact any species of concern and that any potential impacts would be minor.

H. Demands on Environmental Resources of Water, Air, and Energy

Due to the relatively small size of the facility, the proposed project would only require small quantities of water, air, and energy for proper operation. Only small quantities of water would be required for dust suppression of emissions being generated at the site. Any additional impacts to air resources would be minor because the source is an existing minor industrial source of emissions, with intermittent and seasonal operations, and because air pollutants generated by the facility would be widely dispersed (see Section 8.F of this EA). Energy requirements would be small because the facility would be powered by one industrial diesel generator. Overall, any impacts of the proposed project to water, air, and energy resources would be minor.

I. Historical and Archaeological Sites

The Department previously contacted the Montana Historical Society - State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) in an effort to identify any historical and/or archaeological sites that may be present in the proposed area of construction/operation. Search results concluded that there are no previously recorded historical or archaeological resources of concern within the area proposed for initial operations. According to past correspondence from the Montana State Historic Preservation Office, there would be a low likelihood of adverse disturbance to any known archaeological or historic site given previous industrial disturbance to an area. Therefore, no impacts upon historical or archaeological sites would be expected as a result of the proposed project because the operational site has already been disturbed and because no previously recorded historical/archaeological resources have been identified at the proposed operational site location.

J. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

The crushing/screening operation would cause minor cumulative and secondary impacts to the physical and biological aspects of the human environment because the facility would be limited in the amount of PM, PM₁₀, NO_x, VOC, CO, and SO_x emissions to be generated. Additional emissions and noise generated from the proposed project would, at most, result in only minor impacts to the area of operations because of the proposed equipment location for the crushing/screening plant and because it would be seasonal and temporary in nature. The proposed project would be short-term in nature, and have minor cumulative effects upon resource within the area. These resources include water, terrestrial and aquatic life, soils, and vegetation.

Further, the Department determined that this existing crushing/screening facility would be a minor source of emissions as defined under the Title V Operating Permit Program because the source's emissions was limited below the major source threshold level of 100 tons per year for any regulated pollutant. Overall, cumulative and secondary impacts to the physical and biological aspects of the human environment would be minor.

9. The following table summarizes the potential economic and social effects of the proposed project on the human environment. The “no action alternative” was discussed previously.

		Major	Moderate	Minor	None	Unknown	Comments Included
A.	Social Structures and Mores				X		yes
B.	Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity				X		yes
C.	Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue			X			yes
D.	Agricultural or Industrial Production			X			yes
E.	Human Health			X			yes
F.	Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities			X			yes
G.	Quantity and Distribution of Employment				X		yes
H.	Distribution of Population				X		yes
I.	Demands for Government Services			X			yes
J.	Industrial and Commercial Activity			X			yes
K.	Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals			X			yes
L.	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts			X			yes

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON POTENTIAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL EFFECTS: The following comments have been prepared by the Department.

A. Social Structures and Mores

The proposed project would cause no disruption to the social structures and mores in the area because the source is an existing minor industrial source of emissions and would only have temporary and intermittent operations. Further, the proposed project would be required to operate according to the conditions that would be placed in Permit #2566-06 and Addendum #2, which would limit the effects to social structures and mores.

B. Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity

The cultural uniqueness and diversity of this area would not be impacted by the proposed project because it would operate at sites that have been used for crushing/screening of aggregate and is separated from the general population. Additionally, the proposed project would be a portable/temporary source with seasonal and intermittent operations. Therefore, the cultural uniqueness and diversity of the area would not be affected.

C. Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue

The proposed project would have little, if any, impact on the local and state tax base and tax revenue because the proposed project would be an existing minor industrial source of emissions and would have seasonal and intermittent operations. The proposed project would require the use of only a few existing employees. Thus, only minor impacts to the local and state tax base and revenue could be expected from the employees and facility production. Furthermore, the impacts to local tax base and revenue would be minor because the source would be portable and the money generated for taxes would be widespread.

D. Agricultural or Industrial Production

The additional emissions associated with the proposed project would have only a minor impact on local industrial production since the proposed project would be a minor source of aggregate production and air emissions. Also, the proposed project would locate in an area that has been used for the crushing/screening of aggregate and is separated from the general population. Therefore, because minimal deposition of air pollutants would occur on the surrounding land (see Section 8.F of this EA), only minor and temporary effects on the surrounding vegetation would occur. In addition, the proposed project would be temporary in nature and would be permitted with operational conditions and limitations that would minimize impacts upon surrounding vegetation (see Section 8.D of this EA).

E. Human Health

Permit #2566-06 would incorporate conditions to ensure that the proposed project would be operated in compliance with all applicable air quality rules and standards. These rules and standards are designed to be protective of human health. As described in Section 8.F. of this EA, the air emissions from the proposed project would be minimized by the use of water spray and other process limits that would be required by Permit #2566-06. Also, the proposed project would be operating on a temporary basis and pollutants would be dispersed (see Section 8.F of this EA). Therefore, only minor impacts would be expected on human health from the proposed project.

F. Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities

Additional noise from the proposed project would be minor because the proposed project would be small, would operate on a seasonal and intermittent basis, and would be operating at an existing industrial open-cut pit site. As a result, the amount of noise generated from the proposed project would be minimal. Also, this existing facility would be a relatively minor industrial source of emissions. Therefore, any changes in the quality of recreational and wilderness activities created by the proposed project at this site would be expected to be minor and intermittent.

G. Quantity and Distribution of Employment

The proposed project would only require a few existing employees to operate and would have seasonal and intermittent operations. No individuals would be expected to permanently relocate to this area of operation as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, no effects upon the quantity and distribution of employment in this area would be expected.

H. Distribution of Population

The proposed project is a portable industrial facility that would only require a few existing employees to operate. No individuals would be expected to permanently relocate to this area of operation as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact the normal population distribution in the area of operation.

I. Demands of Government Services

Minor increases would be seen in traffic on existing roadways in the area as a result of the proposed project. In addition, government services would be required for acquiring the appropriate permits for the proposed project and to verify compliance with the permits that would be issued. Demands for government services would be minor.

J. Industrial and Commercial Activity

The proposed project would represent only a minor increase in the industrial activity in the proposed area of operation because the proposed project would be a relatively small industrial source that would be portable and temporary in nature. No additional industrial or commercial activity would be expected as a result of the proposed operation.

K. Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals

JTL would be allowed, by Permit #2566-06 to operate in areas designated by EPA as attainment or unclassified for ambient air quality. Addendum #2 would allow JTL to operate at any location in or within 10 km of certain PM₁₀ nonattainment areas during the summer months (April 1 through September 30) and at sites approved by the Department during the winter months (October 1 through March 31). Permit #2566-06 would contain limits for protecting air quality and to keep facility emissions in compliance with any applicable ambient air quality standards, as a locally adopted environmental plan or goal for operating at this proposed site. Because the proposed project would have intermittent and seasonal operations, any impacts from the proposed project would be minor and short-lived.

L. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

The proposed project would cause minor cumulative and secondary impacts to the social and economic aspects of the human environment in the immediate area of operation because the source would be a portable and temporary source. Further, no other industrial operations are expected to result from the current permit action. Minor increases in traffic would have minor effects on local traffic in the immediate area. Because the source is relatively small and temporary, only minor economic impacts to the local economy would be expected from operating the facility. Further, this facility may be operated in conjunction with other equipment owned and operated by JTL, but any cumulative impacts upon the social and economic aspects of the human environment would be minor and short-lived. Thus, only minor and temporary cumulative effects would result to the local economy.

Recommendation: An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required.

If an EIS is not required, explain why the EA is an appropriate level of analysis: All potential effects resulting from construction and operation of the proposed facility are minor; therefore, an EIS is not required.

Other groups or agencies contacted or which may have overlapping jurisdiction: Montana Department of Environmental Quality - Permitting and Compliance Division (Industrial and Energy Minerals Bureau); Montana Natural Heritage Program; and the State Historic Preservation Office (Montana Historical Society).

Individuals or groups contributing to this EA: Montana Department of Environmental Quality (Air Resources Management Bureau and Industrial and Energy Minerals Bureau), Montana State Historic Preservation Office (Montana Historical Society).

EA prepared by: Eric Thunstrom

Date: March 29, 2007